



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

advanced where deserved, and in a few cases where they were undeserved. Local conditions throughout the Province do not justify all libraries taking their full rate from the first year. We expect that increased expenditures and better and larger service will go hand in hand. We believe that our *principle* of taxation will stand the test of time, and that the libraries will

advance in merit and the public will derive increasing benefit. It is our hope that our people will want library service far in advance of present-day demands, and that when a higher per capita income from taxation is required it shall be granted by our legislators with the same good will that characterized their attitude toward fifty cents per capita.

## THE ONTARIO LIBRARY LAW AND AMERICAN LIBRARIES

BY SAMUEL H. RANCK, *Grand Rapids Public Library*

My interest in the Ontario Library Law and its application to American Libraries was first developed last fall in connection with a report on the income of Michigan Libraries for the Michigan Library Association. Of the cities of Michigan of approximately 10,000 population or over, six cities only out of the twenty-four that reported had expenditures in 1920 of more than fifty cents per capita for maintenance. This included money from all sources. Detroit and Grand Rapids exceeded the fifty cent minimum.

This matter was further discussed and investigated in connection with the paper before the Council in Chicago last winter, on "Sources and responsibilities of public library revenues."

For this Swampscott meeting I have been asked to apply the Ontario Law to a few representative libraries. First of all we must realize that the Ontario Library Law provides that a library board may claim fifty cents per capita from the tax-levying authorities of the community and then these authorities are obliged by provincial law to place the amount claimed up to fifty cents per capita to the credit of the public library of the community. The tax-levying body may increase this amount, but the Library Board cannot force any amount above fifty cents per capita.

This fifty cents per capita is exclusive of all other sources of revenue for the library: in other words, it does not include grants from the province, or income from endowments, etc. With these limitations in mind I requested the libraries of

about one hundred American cities to send me their per capita income from city taxes alone for their last library year, and I have worked it out to the per capita basis on the census returns of 1920.

I received up to the time of this meeting reports from eighty-four cities. The average income from city taxation for the year indicated, sometimes 1920, and sometimes 1921, was 53.7 cents, something more, it will be noticed, than can be claimed under the Ontario Library Law: in other words, the average American library as represented in this per capita tabulation from thirty-three states is now receiving more than they might claim under the Ontario Library Law.

Many of the librarians that sent in their reports gave the income for two library years, 1920 and 1921, and the increase in library revenue during the last year for this group of eighty-four libraries is approximately twenty per cent over that of the preceding year.

In an exhaustive study of library revenues count should be taken of all sources of revenue which come to the library. This includes in various parts of the country dog licenses, and licenses of all sorts (in one city this item is \$28,000), penal fines, income from endowments, library book fines, etc., for all of these enter into the matter of library support, but they are not included in the Ontario Library Law, and hence are not included in the tabulation.

Michigan libraries were not included in this tabulation for the reason that the penal fine clause for the state constitution which

applies to most of the libraries of the state is such an important source of revenue that libraries of Michigan are in a class by themselves for this reason: for example, the Detroit Public Library will receive this year about \$150,000 from penal fines, and last year the Grand Rapids Public Library received about \$28,000, and there are libraries in the state where the income from penal fines moneys is very much greater in proportion than this. It may be stated that the per capita income from city taxation alone for both Detroit and Grand Rapids is considerably over fifty cents.

This tabulation also indicates that the libraries of the so-called southern states receive a much smaller revenue per capita than the libraries of the northern states. No library from a southern state in this list, unless you count Kansas City, Mo., as a southern city, receives over fifty cents per capita.

Of the northern states, for the libraries given in this group, Pennsylvania is giving the poorest support.

My recommendation is that the Council of

the American Library Association authorize a further study of this whole subject, which should give consideration to all sources of library revenue, and finally that the American Library Association in the light of all the facts should record its conviction that a reasonable minimum per capita income is necessary for adequate support of a public library, and that the per capita income basis is the proper method to pursue in arriving at the financial needs of a public library. Personally I believe that one dollar per capita is such a reasonable minimum for a community to spend on libraries, if it is going to serve in anything like an adequate way all the people of the community, and if it is to give an excellent service of the quality that many of the states of this country are now giving, considerably more than one dollar per capita will be necessary. It should be understood that in large cities this would include the income from all sources for all libraries that are ordinarily open free to the public, particularly such as the great reference libraries of Chicago and New York, particularly Chicago, which supplement the work of the Public Library.

PER CAPITA INCOME FROM CITY TAXES OF A GROUP OF AMERICAN LIBRARIES FOR THE LIBRARY YEAR INDICATED AS BASED ON THE POPULATION OF 1920

	Population Shown by 1920 Census	Income for maintenance from city taxa- tion for year indicated	Per capita income from city taxa- tion		Population Shown by 1920 Census	Income for maintenance from city taxa- tion for year indicated	Per capita income from city taxa- tion
<b>Alabama</b>				<b>Illinois</b>			
Birmingham.	178,270	\$ 60,000	(21) .336	Chicago ....	2,701,212	833,330.15	(20) .380
Mobile .....	60,777			Decatur ....	43,818	20,597	(21) .468
<b>California</b>				Evanston ...	37,234	20,398.96	(20) .547
Berkeley ...	55,386	49,125	(21) .886	Peoria .....	76,121		
Los Angeles.	575,480	426,714	(21) .741	<b>Indiana</b>			
Oakland ....	216,361	135,972	(21) .628	Fort Wayne..	86,549	45,082.44	(20) .520
Riverside ....	19,341	19,012.49	(21) .983	Gary .....	55,344	69,000	(21)
Sacramento..	65,857	32,273.16	(21) .490	& townships 1.246			
San Francisco	508,410	147,000	(21) .289	<b>Indianapolis</b>			
<b>Colorado</b>				South Bend..	314,194	258,000	(21) .821
Colorado					70,983		
Springs ..	29,572	14,030	(21) .474	<b>Iowa</b>			
Denver .....	256,369	115,000	(?) .448	Des Moines..	126,468	105,745	(Ap.21-22).836
<b>Connecticut</b>				Sioux City..	71,227	44,271.30	(21) .621
Bridgeport .	148,152	117,023.86	(21) .789	<b>Kansas</b>			
Hartford ...	138,036			Kansas City.	101,073		
<b>Income from city not given</b>				Lawrence ..	12,456		
New Haven.	162,390	75,000	(21) .461	Topeka .....	50,022		
<b>Delaware</b>				<b>Kentucky</b>			
Wilmington.	110,168	23,371.04	(20) .212	Louisville ..	234,891	88,409.18	(20) .376
<b>Dist. of Columbia</b>				<b>Louisiana</b>			
Washington..	437,571	128,464.05	(20) .293	New Orleans	387,408	47,100	(20) .121
<b>Florida</b>				<b>Maine</b>			
Jacksonville.	57,699	27,919	(21) .483	Augusta ....	52,548		
<b>Georgia</b>				Bangor .....	25,978	13,500	(21) .519
Atlanta .....	200,616	63,885	(21) .318	Portland ...	69,196	9,000	(21) .130
Savannah ...	83,252						

## PER CAPITA INCOME TAX—Continued

	Population Shown by 1920 Census	Income for maintenance from city taxa- tion for year indicated	Per capita income from city taxa- tion		Population Shown by 1920 Census	Income for maintenance from city taxa- tion for year indicated	Per capita income from city taxa- tion
<b>Maryland</b>				<b>Ohio</b>			
Baltimore ..	733,826	119,203	(20) .162	Akron .....	208,435		
Hagerstown..	28,064	1,000	(20) .035	Cincinnati ..	493,678	250,000	(21) .506
<b>Massachusetts</b>				<b>Hamilton County</b>			
Boston .....	747,923	747,120	(21-22) .998	Cleveland ...	796,836	692,600.27	(20) .869
Brockton ...	66,138	32,000	(21) .483	Columbus ...	237,031	43,525	(21) .182
Cambridge ..	109,456	44,378	(20) .405	Dayton .....	153,830	95,421.83	(21) .620
Fall River..	120,485	55,326.07	(21) .459	E. Cleveland..	27,292	40,000	(21) 1.465
		+ dog tax		Toledo .....	243,109	110,350	(21) .453
Haverhill ...	53,884	28,759.99	(20) .533	<b>Oklahoma</b>			
Lawrence ...	94,270			Oklahoma City	91,258		
Lowell .....	112,479	24,000	(21) .213	<b>Oregon</b>			
New Bedford	121,217	49,500	(20) .408	Portland ...	275,898	246,089.12	(20) .891
		+ dog tax		<b>Multnomah Co.</b>			
Newton .....	46,054	56,450	1.225	Salem .....	17,679		
Pittsfield ...	41,751			<b>Pennsylvania</b>			
Somerville ...	93,033	57,445	(21) .617	Erie .....	102,093	35,000	(21) .342
Springfield ..	129,563	96,451	(21) .744	Harrisburg ...	75,917	10,000	(20-21) .131
Worcester ...	179,741	98,700	(20) .548	Lancaster ...	53,150	3,000	(?) .056
		+7,063 dog licenses		Philadelphia..	1,823,779	464,334.63	(20) .254
<b>Minnesota</b>				Pittsburg ...	588,193	416,320	(21) .770
Duluth .....	98,917			Reading .....	107,784		
Minneapolis..	380,498	262,361.34	(21) .689	Scranton ...	137,783	28,330	(21) .205
St. Paul.....	234,595	198,901	(20) .847	Willkesbarre..	73,828	Endowed wholly	
<b>Missouri</b>				<b>Rhode Island</b>			
Kansas City..	324,410	215,000	(21) .662	Providence ...	237,595	28,500	(20) .119
St. Louis....	773,000	376,333.97	(21) .486			144,916.52	from other sources
<b>Nebraska</b>				<b>Tennessee</b>			
Lincoln .....	54,934	18,744.55	(20) .341	Knoxville ...	77,818	19,562	(20) .251
Omaha .....	191,601	75,000	(21) .391	Memphis ...	162,351	75,324.64	(20) .463
<b>New Hampshire</b>				Nashville ...	118,342	25,000	(21) .211
Concord .....	22,167			<b>Texas</b>			
Manchester ...	78,200	27,000	(20) .345	Austin .....	34,876	No public library	
<b>New Jersey</b>				Dallas .....	158,976	27,300	(21) .171
Camden .....	116,309	33,000	(21) .283	Houston .....	138,076	43,000	(21) .311
Jersey City...	297,864	143,437.50	(21) .481	San Antonio..	161,308	16,139.09	(21) .100
Newark .....	414,216	200,000	(21) .482	<b>Vermont</b>			
Trenton .....	119,389	53,470	(21) .447	Burlington ...	22,779		
<b>New York</b>				<b>Washington</b>			
Albany .....	113,334			Seattle .....	315,362	270,405.35	(21) .857
Brooklyn .....	2,018,356	632,119.32	.313			+ Licenses, etc.	
Buffalo .....	508,875	281,046	(21-22) .555	Spokane ....	104,437	76,600	(21) .756
		(Includes Grosvenor Ref. L.)		Tacoma .....	96,963	56,184	(21) .579
New York				<b>Wisconsin</b>			
(3 boroughs) ..	3,132,650	1,097,683.60	(21) .354	Kenosha ....	40,472	54,693.32	(21-22) 1.351
New York				Madison ....	38,378	29,793.75	(21) .776
(Greater) .....	5,620,048	2,082,523.50	(21) .370	Milwaukee ...	457,147	202,000	(21) .441
Rochester ...	295,850			Racine .....	58,593	34,000	(21) .580
Syracuse ...	171,647	81,000	(21) .471				84) 45153
Utica .....	94,136	64,040	(21) .680				.537

SHOULD PUBLIC LIBRARY BOARDS HAVE THE POWER TO LEVY THE  
LIBRARY TAXBy W. J. HAMILTON, *Secretary Public Library Commission of Indiana*

My answer to the question under discussion is "Yes indeed." This may not prove strictly constitutional in all states, it may not always march with formal logic, but it is most expedient, practical, and successful.

In the first place, who has the greatest responsibility, the keenest interest in the library, the most intimate knowledge of its needs? The board of trustees. The men and women who are appointed or

selected to this particular charge are seldom politically inclined, the library is hardly regarded by the mass of citizens as of enough importance for this. They are apt to be selected from those having at least an academic interest in the intellectual welfare of the community, and may be safely trusted not to abuse any powers given them.

There is a difference of opinion as to advisability of mentioning a maximum